

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **07 February 2008**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-45. Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Examiner rejected claims 1 6, 8, 11, 13-15, 16, 21, 23, 26, 28-30, 31, 36, 38, 41, and 43-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Pullela et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,313,667 hereinafter “Pullela”), and Sala et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0117998 hereinafter “Sala”). Examiner rejected claims 2, 17, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Pullela, Sala, and Tsuruoka (U.S. Patent No. 6,546,391 hereinafter “Tsuruoka”). Examiner rejected claims 5, 7, 20, 22, 35, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Pullela, Sala, and Noven (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,297 hereinafter “Noven”). Examiner has objected to claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 18, 19, 24, 25, 27, 33, 34, 39, 40 and 42 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten.

Amendment to the specification

Applicant has amended paragraph [0041] to correct typographical errors. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicant has amended claim 10 to remove the objected language. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and allowable subject matter

Examiner rejected claims 1 6, 8, 11, 13-15, 16, 21, 23, 26, 28-30, 31, 36, 38, 41, and 43-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Pullela et al. (U.S. Patent

No. 7,313,667 hereinafter “Pullela”), and Sala et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0117998 hereinafter “Sala”). Examiner rejected claims 2, 17, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Pullela, Sala, and Tsuruoka (U.S. Patent No. 6,546,391 hereinafter “Tsuruoka”). Examiner rejected claims 5, 7, 20, 22, 35, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Pullela, Sala, and Noven (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,297 hereinafter “Noven”). Examiner has objected to claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 18, 19, 24, 25, 27, 33, 34, 39, 40 and 42 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten.

Applicant has rewritten allowable claims 4, 19, and 34 in independent form as claims 1, 16, and 31. No new matter has been added. Claims 2-4, 17-19, and 32-34 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 16, and 31 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 5-15, which depend upon claim 1, claims 20-30, which depend upon claim 16, and claims 35-45, which depend upon claim 31, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance.
Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 7 May 2008

Shun Yao
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com